

**Minutes of the Carlisle Board of Health  
March 5, 2013**

Present: Board members Jeff Brem (Chairman), Catherine Galligan, Bill Risso, Vallabh Sarma, Donna Margolies; Linda Fantasia (Agent); Rob Frado (TCG), Karina Coombs (Mosquito)

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman at 7:00 pm. at Carlisle Town Hall.

**ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS**

**Gleason Library** – DEP has approved design flow of 335 GPD for tank upgrade. BOH must monitor meter readings for at least one year. Funding is a Long Term Cap request for spring town meeting. Work could start in July.

**MassDPH Grant (\$500)** – possible project would be to hire a consultant to conduct a computerized baseline brain assessment which could be used to assess future head injuries from sports. This was done in Norwell and well received by the community. Money would be used to offset some of the cost of the assessment. It would require use of the school's computer lab. Application due 3/25/13. (Margolies arrives).

**Septic Loan Program** – A small discussion group was held at the Library earlier in the day. Frado explained what was involved in a Title 5 Inspection and Fantasia explained the septic loan program. Council on Aging would like to include the discussion on their monthly CCTV program in April. The Board agreed. Frado's time is being funded from the Title 5 Administrative Grant.

**BOH Laptop** – Region 4A is covering the \$998 cost of a new laptop.

**MINUTES** – next meeting.

**BILLS** – wages and salaries. Fantasia worked 3 hours under the Title 5 Septic Loan Administrative Grant. **It was moved (Galligan) and seconded (Risso) to pay the bills as presented. Motion passed 5-0-0.**

**FY14 Budget Planning** – Jerry Lerman (Fincom Chairman) stepped in to say how pleased his Committee was to have a detailed budget summary. Galligan had prepared the report in preparation for a meeting with Fincom on 3/4/13. Galligan, Risso and Fantasia attended the meeting. There is a projected overrun in the FY13 BOH Operating account as a result of nursing costs, supplies, and wages for the administrative assistant. The overrun in the administrative assistant line reflects that tasks normally charged to the 53E ½ revolving account were charged to the operating budget in order to stabilize the 53E ½ account. At a previous meeting Fincom agreed to subsidize engineering costs of \$3300 until the revolving account stabilizes. After reviewing the FY 13 budget, the Board agreed this might not be enough. Fincom agreed to increase the amount to \$4500. The money will go into the FY13 engineering line item to cover engineering expenses and part time wages so that the revolving account can rebuild. The Board is reviewing and revising permit fees but it will take time until the account is replenished. The proposed FY14 budget, excluding cost of living and step adjustments, is only 1.4% over guideline (or \$1180). Galligan and Fantasia had met with Finance Director who supported the increase. It was felt that the FY13 budget was unrealistic for meeting required Health Department obligations.

**Fees** – Galligan has been reviewing current fees compared to estimated costs by developing a spreadsheet that breaks down each type of fee into time and cost of associated services. In most cases the fees do not cover the cost. This is one of the reasons that the revolving account balance has dropped so low. Galligan asked how the overrun should be paid. Brem said that it is difficult matching a specific cost to each permit. At the last meeting the Board increased the application fee from \$975 (conventional) and \$1050 (alternative) to a single fee of \$1150. The Board will consider reducing the number of inspections from four to two as a cost savings but this requires amending the local regulations. Risso said he would agree if there was a separate cost for additional inspections. He would also like to separate fees for new v. repairs so that failed systems receive a break and more of the burden is placed on new construction development. Brem said the operating costs should reflect the Board's policies not regulations. Risso said both are based on protecting groundwater. Brem agreed but noted that because the Board uses a consultant rather than its agent, the work costs more. Brem does not think the town should continue to subsidize this

high standard. On the other hand if a mistake is made as a result of less oversight, it can be costly to remedy. (Frado arrives). Risso did not think that the town should subsidize developers. Brem questioned how many other towns have more than three inspections. According to the analysis, management time is sometimes more than field work. The Board agreed to have Frado explain. The Board agreed to continue the discussion later in the meeting.

**PH Cont. 750 CONCORD ROAD - replacement of failed septic system: initial proposed system requesting local and state variances:**

**310 CMR 15.00 (TITLE 5)**

1. Section 15. 211- Reduction of the setback from the property line to the proposed septic tank from ten (10) feet to seven (7) feet; *(eliminated with redesign)*
2. Section 15. 211- Reduction of the setback from the property line to the proposed pump chamber from ten (10) feet to eight (8) feet; *(eliminated with redesign)*
3. Section 15. 211- Reduction of the setback from the existing well to the proposed SAS Area from one hundred (100) feet to eighty (80) feet; *(eliminated with redesign)*
4. Section 15. 211- Reduction of the setback from the property line to the proposed SAS Area from ten (10) feet to five (5) feet; *(eliminated with redesign)*
5. Section 15.255- Allow the use of an impervious barrier in lieu of the required fifteen (15) foot offset for "Breakout" between the SAS Area and the slope;

**TOWN OF CARLISLE SUPPLEMENTARY SEWAGE DISPOSAL REGULATIONS:**

1. Section 15. 221- Waive the Soil Absorption Area sizing requirement of 165 gallons per day per bedroom and allow the use of the Title 5 requirement of 110 gallons per day per bedroom, due to site restrictions.

Lucinda Cutrer, owner, and abutters Chip and Deborah Dewing, Kitty and George Shepard, and Steve Poole of Lakeview Engineering Assoc. appeared before the Board.

Poole submitted a revised plan addressing deficiencies noted in previous submittal. The modified design includes a Cultec alternative system. The leaching area now meets the 100' setback to the well and since it is only 1' above grade will not require a retaining wall along Concord Street. Poole investigated putting the system in the back of the lot but prefers the Concord Road side. The lot has a steep drop off in the back making access difficult. A number of trees would need to be removed. He was unaware that the adjacent lot was under same ownership but it provided no advantages. The system is designed for 110 GPD instead of the local 165 GPD requirement. Risso asked about shifting the field south so it could meet the local design flow. Frado said the ground starts to drop off near the leaching area. It could be done but there would be cost impacts. The design includes a 5' offset to groundwater based on the 2 mpi percolation rate. Poole explained that they are still asking for a waiver for the setback to the impervious barrier. DEP has a policy to allow a reduction from the 15' offset without a waiver which some towns accept. He has no problem with asking for the waiver. The house has six rooms including three bedrooms. A floor plan was not submitted.

Cutrer felt it was a good, environmentally sound design. She was not inclined to drill a new well since the existing one has good flow and good water quality. There is no guarantee a new well would be as good. Visually and practically speaking the new design is the best for the site and the neighborhood. Chip Dewing agreed that his concerns have been addressed. He did not want a retaining wall along Concord Street. His one remaining concern is if the system could be enlarged if the property sold. Brem said it is a legal non-conforming lot. There might be zoning considerations. The Board is willing to grant waivers for repairs but new construction must be fully compliant. An increase in flow would be considered new construction under Title 5.

George Shepard wanted to know about the Cultec system and how it operates. The Board explained the technology. He asked about the flow direction. Frado said the testing showed pure sand. This is why there is a 5' separation from groundwater to allow for additional treatment of effluent. By the time waste water reaches groundwater it has been filtered so flow direction is not that important. Risso said alternative systems typically have improved treatment of effluent.

The Board did not have a problem with the 330 GPD design. A garbage grinder deed restriction will be required prior to starting work. There were no other comments.

**It was moved (Margolies) and seconded (Sarma) to close the public hearing. Motion passed 5-0-0.**

**It was moved (Risso) and seconded (Margolies) to grant a waiver from 310 CRM 15.211 Minimum Setback Distances for use of an impervious barrier in lieu of the required 15' offset distance to the break out slope for plan entitled "Sewage Disposal System, 750 Concord Street, Carlisle, MA, prepared by Lakeview Engineering Associates, revised 2/19/13". Motion passed 5-0-0.**

**It was moved (Risso) and seconded (Sarma) to grant a waiver from the Town of Carlisle Supplementary Sewage Disposal Regulations: Section 15.221: Design Flow requirement of 165 gpd per bedroom and allow the use of Title 5 requirement of 110 gpd for plan entitled "Sewage Disposal System, 750 Concord Street, Carlisle, MA, prepared by Lakeview Engineering Associates, revised 2/19/13". Motion passed 5-0-0.**

**It was moved (Risso) and seconded (Margolies) to approve plan entitled "Sewage Disposal System, 750 Concord Street, Carlisle, MA, prepared by Lakeview Engineering Associates, revised 2/19/13" conditional upon compliance with DEP Approval of the Cultec System General Use Certificate dated 2/22/10, submittal and verification of a floor plan, and proof of recording of a Garbage Grinder Deed Restriction prior to release of the construction permit and changing Concord to Carlisle on the plan. Motion passed 5-0-0.**

**FEES** – The Board resumed its discussion on fees from the previous meeting of January 29, 2013.

The Board asked Fantasia to check with DEP on whether the Board can charge a different fee for new v. repair systems. The Board also asked Fantasia and Frado to meet and review the assumptions of the fee analysis, particularly amount of time for field work. Brem agreed that initially new technologies take more time, but that should lessen now that there are more of these designs submitted. It should be possible to get hard numbers on plan reviews, inspections and as-builts. Administration costs should decrease as a result of his reducing the number of trips to town hall, meetings with the agent, consultations with other department and no direct contact from engineers and installers. Brem said the Board needs a list of activities that are operational and not permit specific. These need to be documented for the Finance Committee. Fincom is concerned about a potential 8% tax increase and containing costs.

The Board noted that according to the Fee Analysis the estimated cost of installing an active alternative system is \$2800. The high cost might discourage applicants whereas the Board wants to encourage these systems. It might be possible to reduce the application fee by reducing the number of prepaid inspections. For conventional systems Frado said additional inspections could be required based on the specifics of the site. For example, a mounded system with steep breakout slopes might warrant a final grade inspection to verify slope stabilization. An engineer may not consider this when preparing the as-built. The Board agreed that what is shown on paper (as-built plan) can be different from what is visually in the field. Lack of oversight could cause eventual erosion and damage to the system. Frado might not want to sign a full Certificate since he would not be doing the final inspection.

The Board reviewed the time involved in engineering activities. The initial review typically takes 1-1 ½ hours. As-built plans take about ½ hour. There was a question on whether an inspection takes a full hour. Frado bills ½ hr. per site but administrative and travel are billed under management. Galligan said the Board needs to clarify this so correct data is entered into the spreadsheet. Risso said he prefers to keep all four inspections. Sarma did not like the idea of a partial Certificate of Compliance. The Board agreed that the most important engineering time is spent on inspections – getting the system into the ground correctly. Frequently a system only needs three inspections – excavation of bed, fill in place and pipes and a final grade. Two as-builts (partial and final grade) are required. The Board favored changing four to three required inspections. The Board has a fee for special services and non-Wednesday appointments. This is in addition to the fee for the activity.

The Board agreed to increase the fee for reading observation pipes. The current fee is \$50 for the same lot. Estimated cost is \$114-\$130. Risso and Galligan did not have a problem with increasing the fee which has not been changed since 2006.

**It was moved (Risso) and seconded (Galligan) to increase the fee for observation pipes (2 on the same building lot) to \$115. Discussion: Sarma suggested covering the full \$130 cost. Galligan preferred economizing on the administrative assistant's time to reduce the total cost. Motion passed 4-1(Brem)-0.**

The Board then discussed soil testing fees. Frado said testing for repairs often takes less time. The site is limited by what it there. Problems arise with ledge and compact soils. Percolation tests can take up to 3 hours; on average testing takes about 4 hours on a site with bad soils. The current fee is \$350 for up to 3 hours. The second visit starts with \$150 for up to one hour. Galligan estimated costs at \$579 and suggests \$450. Brem said \$579 was a 67% increase. The Board agreed to establish \$500 for up to three hours per building lot. This is only a 44% increase. The Board agreed to also increase the fee for subsequent visits from \$150 to \$210. The Board agreed that it will be important to review its fees every two years.

**It was moved (Risso) and seconded (Galligan) to increase the soil testing fee from \$350 to \$500 for up to 3 hours on the same building lot. Motion passed 5-0-0.**

**It was moved (Galligan) and seconded (Risso) to increase the fee for subsequent testing on the same lot from \$150 to \$210 for up to one hour of engineering time. Motion passed 4-1(Brem)-0.**

**It was moved (Sarma) and seconded (Margolies) to set a fee of \$300 for up to two additional installation inspections beyond those currently required. Motion passed 5-0-0.**

The Board also charges a late cancellation fee of \$150. Frado said he charges the town a flat rate of \$150 to cover the time booked in his schedule. This has been in place since 2006. Brem thought this should be fine not a fee. A fee is for a permit. A fine is for failure to comply. The Board debated whether it should be a fine or a fee and how it would be administered. The Board was unable to come to a consensus and the item was tabled until the next meeting.

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**MAHB/DEP Seminar** – Risso, Fantasia and Frado attended the workshop. Risso learned that latex paint can be a major contributor to a failed septic system. This would include washing brushes in a sink. Liquid detergents are also better for systems than powders.

**Upcoming Dates:** Rabies Clinic 3/16/13; Hazardous Waste Collection 5/4/13.

There was no further business. Meeting voted to adjourn at 10:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda M. Fantasia,  
Recorder